*International Journal of Environment and Climate Change*

***Volume 12, Issue 12, Page 405-413, 2022; Article no.IJECC.90819***
***ISSN: 2581-8627***
*(Past name: British Journal of Environment & Climate Change, Past ISSN: 2231–4784)*

# Enzymatic Activity and Efficacy of Plant Growth Promoting *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* on Feeding Behaviour of *Spodoptera frugiperda* on Maize

**Ranjith Sellappan [a*] and Kalaiselvi Thangavel [a]**

[a] *Department of Agricultural Microbiology, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, India.*

***Authors' contributions***

*This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

***Article Information***

DOI: 10.9734/IJECC/2022/v12i121475

**Open Peer Review History:**
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/90819

***Original Research Article***

***Received: 29/06/2022***
***Accepted: 22/08/2022***
***Published: 03/12/2022***

## ABSTRACT

Maize is a third important cereal crop which has been heavily infested with the invasive pest *Spodoptera frugiperda*. An alternate biological mode of control is necessary instead of seeking inorganic chemical control. Plant endophytes could be of great option for controlling plant pathogens and pest. In this context, the present study aimed to evaluate the potential of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* isolated from maize (COH6) leaf apoplastic fluid. This bacterium was found to have plant growth promoting traits like indole acetic acid, siderophore, ammonia and hydrogen cyanide production. In addition, it was found to produce hydrolytic enzymes such as protease, pectinase, chitinase, and lipase which imply its bioprotective potential. Further foliar spray of *B. amyloliquefaciens* with cell concentration of $10^8$ CFU $ml^{-1}$ on 4 days old maize seed germination @

**Corresponding author: E-mail: s.ranjith994@gmail.com, vimalakil95@gmail.com;*

5 ml per plant showed greater colonization percentage ($8.30\times10^{8}$ CFU $g^{-1}$ fresh leaf) over other doses (1, 2, 3 & 4 ml $plant^{-1}$). The highest feeding deterrence was observed when *Spodoptera frugiperda* fed on leaves inoculated with 5 ml of *B. amyloliquefaciens*.

*Keywords: Bacillus; endophytes; fall armyworm; maize; plant protection.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Maize is an important cereal crop used as food, feed and forage. It is also one of the components of various industrial products. Production of maize grain accounts for around 6% of all cereals production [1]. The production and productivity of maize grain in the past few years reduced significantly due to heavy infestation by the invasive pest *Spodoptera frugiperda* [2]. Although many chemical agents are available for control, it is necessary to develop eco-friendly management techniques.

Plant-associated beneficial microbes not only improve plant nutrition. They also improve plant health by imparting resistance and/or resilience against abiotic and biotic stressors. Particularly, endophytes which reside inside the plant are essential for the growth and health of plants. In plants, the apoplast is a place of interaction between external invaders and microorganisms [3]. This particular niche is considered as is major space for endophytic microorganisms with the ability to induce plant tolerance against various stressors [4]. Among various endophytic bacterial genera, *Bacillus* spp are common and dominant endophytic bacteria that reside in most plant species [5]. Metabolites of *Bacillus* sp were found to play important role in plant growth and defense elicitation against various environmental stressors [6]. In addition, *Bacillus* sp with the ability to produce plant growth hormones such as indole acetic acid (IAA) and gibberellic acid (GA) improves plant growth and defense [7]. In yet another study [8], it was revealed that plant endophytic *Bacillus* spp produces cell-wall-degrading enzymes such as chitinases, protease, cellulase, glucanase, and metabolites like lipopeptides and hydrogen cyanide is capable of providing defense against numerous pathogenic bacteria, fungi, nematodes, viruses and pests. *Bacillus* spp induced physiological changes such as priming antioxidants and defense-related metabolites against biotic and abiotic stressors in plants were also evidenced [9].

In this context, the present study was aimed to characterize apoplastic fluid isolate namely *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* MZ895491 for its potential plant growth promoting and bioprotective traits against *S. frugiperda* infestation in maize under gnotobiotic conditions.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Maize seeds were obtained from the Department of Millets, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore. The bacterium, *B. amyloliquefaciens* (MZ895491) was isolated from maize (COH6) leaf apoplastic fluid (unpublished data). *Spodoptera frugiperda* egg mass was obtained from The National Bureau of Agricultural Insect Resources (NBAIR), Bangalore, India.

### 2.1 Plant Growth Promoting Characteristic of *B. amyloliquefaciens*

#### 2.1.1 Production of indole acetic acid (IAA)

10 ml of Luria-Bertani medium was inoculated with 1 ml *B. amyloliquefaciens* culture and incubated at room temperature for 7 days. After incubation, the broth was centrifuged at 12,000 rpm for 15 min. Then 1 ml supernatant was mixed with 2 ml of Salkowski reagent. The development of pink colour indicated a positive test for IAA production [10].

#### 2.1.2 Siderophore formation

A loopful of log phase culture was streaked on chrome azurol succinic (CAS) acid medium and incubated for 48 hr (Lenin et al., 2012). Yellow colour halo zone formation around the colonies indicated a positive test of siderophore production.

#### 2.1.3 Ammonia production

The bacterium was cultured in 10 ml peptone broth and incubated for 72 h at 30°C. After incubation, the culture was centrifuged at 10,000 rpm for 10 min and the supernatant was collected. To the supernatant (1 ml), 0.5 ml of Nessler's reagent was added. The development of yellow colour indicated a positive result in ammonia production [11].

#### 2.1.4 Production of hydrogen cyanide (HCN)

The bacterial culture was streaked on a tryptic soya agar medium containing glycine (4.4 g/l). The alkaline picric acid soaked filter paper was placed on the lid of the petriplate and sealed with parafilm and incubated at room temperature for four days. A change in colour of the filter paper from yellow to brown indicated a positive test of HCN production [12].

#### 2.1.5 Lipase activity

The bacterium was streaked on tributyrin agar medium and incubated for two days at room temperature. The positive lipase activity was observed from the formation of a clear zone around the colony [13].

#### 2.1.6 Protease activity

A loopful of *B. amyloliquefaciens* was streaked on skimmed milk agar medium. The clear zone around the colony after 24h indicated a positive result [14].

#### 2.1.7 Pectinase activity

Log phase culture of *B. amyloliquefaciens* was streaked on a pectinase screening medium and incubated for two days at room temperature. The clear zone around the colony indicated a positive test for pectinase activity [15].

#### 2.1.8 Chitinase activity

Log phase culture of *B. amyloliquefaciens* was streaked on colloidal chitin agar medium and incubated for seven days at 30°C. The clear zone around the colony indicated a positive test for chitinase activity [16].

#### 2.1.9 Growth curve analysis for *B. amyloliquefaciens*

The growth pattern of *B. amyloliquefaciens* was assessed by measuring the optical density (OD) at 600 nm at 4h intervals for 48 h [17]. Using the OD value growth curve was obtained. Generation time and specific growth rate was calculated as follow (Heerdan et al., 2017).

$$G = t/n$$

$$N = \frac{(\log N1 - \log N0)}{\log 2}$$

$$R = \frac{1}{G}$$

'G' is the generation time, log N0 and log N1 are the number of cells at an early and late time point in exponential phase respectively, 't' is the time between 'N0' and 'N1' and 'R' is the specific growth rate.

### 2.2 Colonizing Potential of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* on Maize Leaves

#### 2.2.1 Experimental design

Maize seeds (COH6) were surface sterilized with 1.6% sodium hypochlorite and placed on Hoagland's nutrient agar medium (gnotobiotic condition). *B. amyloliquefaciens* grown in nutrient broth (24h) was centrifuged at 12,000 rpm for 15 min and the bacterial concentration ($10^8$ CFU $ml^{-1}$) was adjusted with sterile distilled water. After four days of seed germination, the culture was sprayed over the foliar region using a hand sprayer with different volumes (1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 ml). Control plants were sprayed with sterile distilled water. Totally two sets were maintained. One set was used for whole plant bioassay and another set was used for re-isolation of *B. amyloliquefaciens*. Each set contained six treatments and three replications.

#### 2.2.2 Re-isolation of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* from treated maize leaves

*B. amyloliquefaciens* colonization in maize was evaluated through the re-isolation technique. After 48 h of foliar spray, the plants were uprooted and the leaves were surface sterilized with 70% alcohol for 1 min. After that immersed in 2.5% sodium hypochlorite and finally 30 seconds in 90% ethanol; then thoroughly washed with sterile distilled water ten times [18]. After surface sterilization, the leaves were blotted on sterile filter paper. Surface sterilized leaves (1g) were ground with 5 ml of phosphate buffer (pH 7.2). After settlement, 1 ml of the leaf extract was serially diluted up to $10^8$ and plated on a nutrient agar medium. After 24 h of incubation, the colonies were counted.

#### 2.2.3 Whole plant bioassay

After 48h of *B. amyloliquefaciens* spray, two second instar larvae of *S. frugiperda* (starved for 2h) were allowed to feed on maize leaf for 24 h.

Then, the nutritional indices such as relative growth rate (RGR), relative consumptive rate (RCR), the efficiency of conversion of ingested food (ECI) and feeding deterrence index(FDI) of *S. frugiperda* larvae were calculated following standard procedure [19].

#### 2.2.4 Plant biomass

After 24h of larval inoculation, the plant total biomass was calculated and denoted as gram per plant (on a dry weight basis).

### 2.3 Statistical Analysis

Statistical analyses were carried out using Microsoft Excel (version 2010) and SPSS (version 16.0). All the analyses were done with of three replications. The Duncan's multiple range test (DMRT) was carried out at $P \leq 0.05$ for bioassay and biomass production analysis.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*Bacillus* spp is one of the common beneficial bacteria inhabiting many plants and improves plant growth and health [7]. Particularly, *B. amyloliquefaciens* gained greater interest among the scientific community due to its potentiality to elicit plant defense against numerous phytopathogens [20] and herbivores [21]. The present study aimed to evaluate the effect of *B. amyloliquefaciens* of maize leaf apoplastic fluid against *S. frugiperda* infestation in maize.

### 3.1 Plant Growth Promoting Characteristics of *B. amyloliquefaciens*

The culture was qualitatively assessed for its ability to produce indole acetic acid (IAA), siderophore, ammonia, hydrogen cyanide (HCN) and hydrolytic enzymes such as lipase, protease and chitinase. Indole acetic acid is one of the important plant growth promoting phytohormones (Duca et al., 2014). Siderophore is an iron chelating compound that plays important role in plant growth through enhanced iron availability. At the same time affect the growth of plant pathogens by depriving them the iron [22]. Hydrogen cyanide (HCN) is an important secondary metabolite that is toxic to biotic stressors [23]. In the present study, the apoplastic fluid bacterium *B. amyloliquefaciens* showed positive results for IAA, siderophore, ammonia and HCN production. The ability to produce hydrolytic enzymes such as lipases, proteases, pectinases, and chitinases indicates the biocontrol property of microorganisms [24]. Lipases hydrolyze waxes, lipoproteins and fat of the insects [25]. Proteases affect insect cuticles, midgut and hemocoel [26]. Chitinases break the cuticle of insect the cell walls [27] and pectinases have a role in pest control by affecting the insect gut [28]. In the current study, *B. amyloliquefaciens* culture was shown to produce all the above mentioned hydrolytic enzymes (Table 1). Ammonia, protease, chitinase enzyme showed higher activity. Siderophore, HCN, lipase and pectinase showed moderate activity and IAA showed lesser activity.

### 3.2 Growth Curve of *B. amyloliquefaciens*

The growth curve of *B. amyloliquefaciens* grown in Luria browth (LB) is shown in Fig. 1. The results revealed the absence of a lag phase and a very lengthy log phase of 20 h. Similarly, the stationary stationary phase was observed between 20 and 40 hr. The generation time and the specific growth rate of the culture were 5.2 ± 0.03 h and 0.142 ± 0.01 $h^{-1}$ respectively.

### 3.3 Re-isolation of Endophytic *B. amyloliquefaciens* from Maize Leaf

The apoplastic endophytic bacterium *B. amyloliquefaciens* was sprayed at different doses (1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 ml $plant^{-1}$) with a concentration of 3.2 x $10^8$ CFU $ml^{-1}$ on maize grown under gnotobiotic conditions (Table 2). Leaf endophytic colonization capacity of *B. amyloliquefacines* (BA) was analyzed by re-isolation technique. The highest colonization ($8.30\times10^8$ cfu $g^{-1}$ of leaf) was observed in $T_6$ (5 ml BA) followed by $T_5$ ($11.93\times10^7$cfu $g^{-1}$). The lowest colonization was ($1.90\times10^4$cfu $g^{-1}$) observed in $T_2$ (1 ml BA). A complete absence of the endophytes was noticed in uninoculated control.

**Table 1. Qualitative analysis of plant growth promoting and bioprotective characteristics of maize apoplastic fluid associated *B. Amyloliquefaciens***

| Treatment | IAA | Siderophore | Ammonia | HCN | Lipase | Protease | Pectinase | Chitinase |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BA | + | ++ | +++ | ++ | ++ | +++ | ++ | +++ |

*Note: BA- Bacillus amyloliquefaciens, IAA- indole acetic acid, HCN- hydrogen cyanide, + - less; ++ - moderate; +++ - High*




**Fig. 1. Growth curve of *B. amyloliquefaciens***

**Table 2. Effect of various doses of *B. amyloliquefaciens* foliar spay on maize endophytic colonization under gnotobiotic condition**

| Treatments | Bacterial count (cfu $g^{-1}$ FL) |
|---|---|
| $T_1$ (C) | ND |
| $T_2$ (1ml BA) | $1.90\times10^4$ (±0.48) |
| $T_3$ (2mlBA) | $3.13\times10^6$ (±0.52) |
| $T_4$ (3ml BA) | $6.70\times10^6$ (±0.12) |
| $T_5$ (4mlBA) | $11.93\times10^7$ (±0.37) |
| $T_6$ (5ml BA) | $8.30\times10^8$ (±0.41) |

*Values are the mean ± standard deviation of experimental data in triplicate. FL- fresh leaf, BA- Bacillus amyloliquefaciens, ND - not detected*

## 3.4 Whole Plant Bioassay

*B. amyloliquefaciens* inoculation significantly altered the feeding characteristics of *S. frugiperda*. The relative growth rate (RGR) of the larva was reduced with an increase in the dose of *B. amyloliquefaciens* (BA) inoculation (Table 3). The relative growth rate (0.53 ± 0.08mg $g^{-1}$ $day^{-1}$) of *S. frugiperda* fed on maize inoculated with 1 ml *B. amyloliquefaciens* (BA) ($T_2$) was on par with un-inoculated control $T_1$ (0.55 ± 0.03 mg $g^{-1}$ $day^{-1}$). The RGR of *S. frugiperda* fed on plants of $T_3$ (2 ml BA) recorded 0.43 ± 0.01 mg $g^{-1}$ $day^{-1}$) and $T_4$ (3 ml BA) recorded 0.43 ± 0.09 mg $g^{-1}$ $day^{-1}$. The lowest growth rate of *S. frugiperda* (0.20 ± 0.02 mg $g^{-1}$ $day^{-1}$) was observed in $T_6$ (5ml BA) which was on par with $T_5$ (0.27 ± 0.01 mg $g^{-1}$ $day^{-1}$).

Other indices like the relative consumptive rate (RCR) of larva was lower in $T_5$ (5 ml BA) (20.0 ± 2.98 mg $g^{-1}$ $day^{-1}$) which was on par with $T_5$ (4 ml BA) (21.67 ± 0.19 mg $g^{-1}$ $day^{-1}$). Efficiency of conversion of ingested food was higher in $T_1$- C+SF (0.21%) and it was on par with $T_2$ - 1 ml BA. Of different doses of inoculation, $T_3$ (2 ml BA) and $T_4$ (3 ml BA) inoculation was one par with each other. The lowest conversion efficiency was observed in $T_5$ – 4 ml BA (0.12%) and $T_6$ 5 ml BA (0.10%). The feeding deterrence index was higher in $T_6$ - 5 ml BA (3.97%) followed by $T_4$ – 3 ml BA (3.79%) and $T_5$ – 4 ml BA (3.42%). The lowest feeding deterrence was observed in $T_2$ -1 ml BA (1.55%) and $T_3$ – 2 ml BA (1.54%).

Similarly, inoculation of endophytic *B. amyloliquefaciens* in hosta plant reduced the feeding of *S. frugiperda* larvae and increased the mortality rate by 30% [21]. Khedher et al., [29] reported that surfactant produced from *B. amyloliquefaciens* AG1 reduced the *S. littoralis* infestation. *Myzus persicae* diet inoculated with cell suspension and cell free supernatant of *B. amyloliquefaciens* reported to cause 100% mortality rate [30]. *B. amyloliquefaciens* A1 inoculation was found to cause 84.29% mortality rate of citrus mealybug [31].

**Table 3. Whole plant bioassay with *S. frugiperda* on maize leaves sprayed with *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* ($10^8$cfu $ml^{-1}$) under gnotobiotic condition**

| Treatments | RCR (mg $g^{-1}$ $day^{-1}$) | RGR (mg $g^{-1}$ $day^{-1}$) | ECI (%) | FDI (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1$ (C+SF) | 26.59 (±0.93)$^a$ | 0.55 (±0.03)$^a$ | 0.21 (±0.03)$^a$ | 0.00 |
| $T_2$ (1ml BA+SF) | 26.66 (±1.32)$^a$ | 0.53 (±0.08)$^a$ | 0.20 (±0.04)$^a$ | 1.55 (±0.19)$^c$ |
| $T_3$ (2 ml BA+SF) | 26.50 (±2.41)$^a$ | 0.43 (±0.01)$^b$ | 0.16 (±0.02)$^b$ | 1.54 (±0.21)$^c$ |
| $T_4$ (3 ml BA+SF) | 26.21 (±1.12)$^a$ | 0.43 (±0.09)$^b$ | 0.16 (±0.08)$^b$ | 3.79 (±0.39)$^a$ |
| $T_5$ (4 ml BA+SF) | 21.67 (±0.19)$^b$ | 0.27 (±0.01)$^c$ | 0.12 (±0.01)$^c$ | 3.42 (±0.79)$^b$ |
| $T_6$ (5 ml BA+SF) | 20.00 (±2.98)$^b$ | 0.20 (±0.02)$^c$ | 0.10 (±0.01)$^c$ | 3.97 (±0.82)$^a$ |
| *P* | 0.046 | 0.06 | 0.055 | 0.07 |

*Values are the mean ± standard error of experimental data in triplicates. Values with different letters are significantly different according to Duncan's test; P ≤ 0.05. RGR- Relative growth rate; RCR- Relative consumptive rate; ECI- Efficiency of conversion of ingested food; FDI- Feeding deterrent index; C- Control; SF- Spodopterafrugiperda; BA- Bacillus amyloliquefaciens*




**Fig. 2. Biomass of maize inoculated with different doses of *B. amyloliquefaciens* in the presence and absence of *S. frugiperda***

## 3.5 Plant Biomass

The plant biomass content of *B. amyloliquefaciens* inoculated (1ml to 2ml) maize after 24h of *S. frugiperda* attack was found to be on par with each other for doses of 1ml to 3ml $plant^{-1}$. However higher dry biomass value was observed in $T_6$ (5ml BA) and $T_5$ (4ml BA) which was on par with each other (Fig. 2).

## 4. CONCLUSION

Changing climatic conditions increased pest and disease attacks. In this regard, it is imperative to uncover proper eco-friendly mitigation measures for sustainable agricultural production. The current study revealed the potentiality of apoplastic fluid *B. amyloliquefaciens* in reducing the feeding capacity of *S. frugiperda* on maize leaves colonized with this endophyte [32,33]. Foliar spray of *B. amyloliquefaciens* @ 5ml/plant significantly reduced the *S. frugiperda* growth. Thus, after confirming the effect of bacterial inoculants at the field level, this can be included as one of the components of an integrated pest management system for sustainable agricultural production.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Raw sequence data of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* reported in this paper have been deposited in the NCBI GenBank under accession number MZ895491.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by DST INSPIRE fellowship (Grand number. IF190265) of Government of India. The authors acknowledge

Department of Agricultural Microbiology, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore for providing all the facilities to carry out the work.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Erenstein O, Jaleta M, Sonder K, Mottaleb K, Prasanna BM. Global maize production, consumption and trade: trends and R&D implications. Food Sec. 2022;1-7.
2. Assefa F, Ayalew D. Status and control measures of fall armyworm (*Spodoptera frugiperda*) infestations in maize fields in Ethiopia: A review. Cogent Food Agric. 2019;5(1):1641902.
   DOI: 10.1080/23311932.2019.1641902
3. Wang Y, Wang Y, Wang Y. Apoplastic proteases: powerful weapons against pathogen infection in plants. Plant Commun. 2020;1(4):100085.
   DOI: 10.1016/j.xplc.2020.100085, PMID 33367249.
4. Du Y, Stegmann M, Misas Villamil JCM. The apoplast as battleground for plant–microbe interactions. New Phytol. 2016; 209(1):34-38.
   DOI: 10.1111/nph.13777, PMID 26625346.
5. Deng Y, Chen H, Li C, Xu J, Qi Q, Xu Y et al. Endophyte Bacillus subtilis evade plant defense by producing lantibiotic subtilomycin to mask self-produced flagellin. Commun Biol. 2019;2(1):1-12.
6. Shafi J, Tian H, Ji M. Bacillus species as versatile weapons for plant pathogens: A review. Biotechnol Biotechnol Equip. 2017; 31(3):446-459.
   DOI: 10.1080/13102818.2017.1286950.
7. Hashem A, Tabassum B, Fathi Abd Allah E. Bacillus subtilis: A plant-growth promoting rhizobacterium that also impacts biotic stress. Saudi J Biol Sci. 2019; 26(6):1291-1297.
   DOI: 10.1016/j.sjbs.2019.05.004, PMID 31516360.
8. Shahid I, Han J, Hanooq S, Malik KA, Borchers CH, Mehnaz S. Profiling of metabolites of Bacillus spp. and their application in sustainable plant growth promotion and biocontrol. Front Sustain Food Syst. 2021;5:605195.
   DOI: 10.3389/fsufs.2021.605195
9. Meena M, Swapnil P, Zehra A, Aamir M, Dubey MK, Goutam J, et al. Beneficial microbes for disease suppression and plant growth promotion. In: Plant-microbe interactions in agro-ecological perspectives. Singapore: Springer. 2017; 395-432.
10. Gang S, Sharma S, Saraf M, Buck M, Schumacher J. Analysis of indole-3-acetic acid (IAA) production in Klebsiella by LC-MS/MS and the Salkowski method. Bio Protoc. 2019;9(9):e3230.
    DOI:10.21769/BioProtoc.3230, PMID 33655016.
11. Kumari P, Meena M, Upadhyay RS. Characterization of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) isolated from the rhizosphere of *Vigna radiata* (mung bean). Biocatal Agric Biotechnol. 2018;16: 155-162.
    DOI: 10.1016/j.bcab.2018.07.029
12. Kesaulya H, Baharuddin, Zakaria B, Syaiful SA. Isolation and physiological characterization of PGPR from potato plant rhizosphere in medium land of Buru Island. Procedia Food Sci. 2015;3:190-199.
    DOI: 10.1016/j.profoo.2015.01.021.
13. Veerapagu M, Narayanan AS, Ponmurugan K, Jeya KR. Screening selection identification production and optimization of bacterial lipase from oil spilled soil. Asian J Pharm Clin Res. 2013; 6(3):62-67.
14. Olajuyigbe FM, Ajele JO. Production dynamics of extracellular protease from Bacillus species. Afr J Biotechnol. 2005; 4(8):776-779.
15. Rania ABA, Jabnoun-Khiareddine H, Nefzi A, Mokni-Tlili S, Daami-Remadi M. Endophytic bacteria from Datura metel for plant growth promotion and bioprotection against Fusarium wilt in tomato. Biocontrol Sci Technol. 2016;26(8):1139-1165.
    DOI: 10.1080/09583157.2016.1188264
16. Wang M, Xing Y, Wang J, Xu Y, Wang G. The role of the chi1 gene from the endophytic bacteria Serratia proteamaculans 336x in the biological control of wheat take-all. Can J Microbiol. 2014;60(8):533-540.

DOI: 10.1139/cjm-2014-0212, PMID 25093749

17. Sethuraman P, Balasubramanian N. Removal of Cr(VI) from aqueous solution using Bacillus subtilis, Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Enterobacter cloacae. Int J Eng Sci Technol. 2010;2(6):1811-1825.
18. Nxumalo CI, Ngidi LS, Shandu JSE, Maliehe TS. Isolation of endophytic bacteria from the leaves of *Anredera cordifolia* CIX1 for metabolites and their biological activities. BMC Complement Med Ther. 2020;20(1):300.

    DOI: 10.1186/s12906-020-03095-z, PMID 33028279.
19. Waldbauer GP. The consumption and utilization of food by insects. Advances in Insect Physiology. 1968;5.

    DOI: 10.1016/S0065-2806(08)60230-1.
20. Ji SH, Paul NC, Deng JX, Kim YS, Yun BS, Yu SH. Biocontrol activity of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* CNU114001 against fungal plant diseases. Mycobiology. 2013; 41(4):234-242.

    DOI: 10.5941/MYCO.2013.41.4.234, PMID 24493945.
21. Li H, Soares MA, Torres MS, Bergen M, White Jr JF. *Endophytic bacterium, Bacillus amyloliquefaciens,* enhances ornamental hosta resistance to diseases and insect pests. J Plant Interact. 2015; 10(1):224-229.

    DOI: 10.1080/17429145.2015.1056261
22. Villarreal-Delgado MF, Villa-Rodríguez ED, Cira-Chávez LA, Estrada-Alvarado MI, Parra-Cota FI, Santos-Villalobos SDL. The genus Bacillus as a biological control agent and its implications in the agricultural biosecurity. Rev Mex fitopatol. 2018; 36(1):95-130.
23. Swiontek Brzezinska MS, Kalwasińska A, Świątczak J, Żero K, Jankiewicz U. Exploring the properties of chitinolytic Bacillus isolates for the pathogens biological control. Microb Pathog. 2020; 148:104462.

    DOI: 10.1016/j.micpath.2020.104462, PMID 32835774.
24. Jadhav HP, Shaikh SS, Sayyed RZ. Role of hydrolytic enzymes of rhizoflora in biocontrol of fungal phytopathogens: An overview. Rhizotrophs Plant Growth Promot Biorem. 2017; 183-203.
25. Gandotra S, Bhuyan PM, Gogoi DK, Kumar A, Subramanian S. Screening of nutritionally important gut bacteria from the lepidopteran insects through qualitative enzyme assays. Proc Natl Acad Sci India Sect B Biol Sci. 2018;88(1):329-337.

    DOI: 10.1007/s40011-016-0762-7
26. Sugio A, Dubreuil G, Giron D, Simon JC. Plant–insect interactions under bacterial influence: Ecological implications and underlying mechanisms. J Exp Bot. 2015; 66(2):467-478.

    DOI: 10.1093/jxb/eru435, PMID 25385767.
27. Veliz EA, Martínez-Hidalgo P, Hirsch AM. Chitinase-producing bacteria and their role in biocontrol. AIMS Microbiol. 2017; 3(3):689-705.

    DOI: 10.3934/microbiol.2017.3.689, PMID 31294182.
28. Shelomi M, Danchin EG, Heckel D, Wipfler B, Bradler S, Zhou X, et al. Horizontal gene transfer of pectinases from bacteria preceded the diversification of stick and leaf insects. Sci Rep. 2016;6(1):26388.

    DOI: 10.1038/srep26388, PMID 27210832.
29. Ben Khedher SB, Boukedi H, Dammak M, Kilani-Feki O, Sellami-Boudawara T, Abdelkefi-Mesrati L, et al. Combinatorial effect of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* AG1 biosurfactant and Bacillus thuringiensis Vip3Aa16 toxin on *Spodoptera littoralis* larvae. J Invertebr Pathol. 2017;144:11-17.

    DOI: 10.1016/j.jip.2017.01.006, PMID 28093209.
30. López-Isasmendi G, Alvarez AE, Petroselli G, Erra-Balsells R, Audisio MC. Aphicidal activity of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* strains in the peach-potato aphid (*Myzus persicae*). Microbiol Res. 2019;226:41-47.

    DOI: 10.1016/j.micres.2019.05.006, PMID 31284943.
31. Mohamedova MS, Valcheva IS, Draganova DG, Naydenov MK, Borisov YB. Effect of *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* A1, *Paenibacillus polymyxa* AB3 and Providencia rettgeri K10 on the citrus mealybug, *Planococcus citri* (Risso) (Hemiptera: Pseudococcidae). Egypt J Biol Pest Control. 2017;27(1).
32. Van Heerden JH, Kempe H, Doerr A, Maarleveld T, Nordholt N, Bruggeman FJ. Statistics and simulation of growth of single bacterial cells: illustrations with *B. subtilis* and *E. coli.* Sci Rep. 2017;7(1):16094.

DOI: 10.1038/s41598-017-15895-4, PMID 29170466.

33. Rouf Shah T, Prasad K, Kumar P. Maize—A potential source of human nutrition and health: A review. Cogent Food Agric. 2016;2(1): 1166995.
DOI: 10.1080/23311932.2016.1166995.



*Peer-review history:*
*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*
*https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/90819*